



DEVRY SMITH FRANK LLP
LAWYERS & MEDIATORS

WOITZIK POLSINELLI LLP
LAWYERS & MEDIATORS

WWW.DEVRYLAW.CA

WWW.DURHAMLAWYER.CA

AUGUST 2021, ISSUE 15

IN THIS ISSUE:

LEGAL GUIDELINES FOR BUSINESSES DURING COVID
EVENTS & SPONSORSHIPS
NEWS & UPDATES
BLOGS
OUR FIRM IS GROWING
LOCATIONS
LETTER FROM OUR MANAGING PARTNER

Our locations

Toronto: 95 Barber Greene Road, Suite 100, Toronto, Ontario M3C 3E9
Barrie: 85 Bayfield Street, Suite 300, Barrie, Ontario L4M 3A7
Whitby: 209 Dundas Street East, Suite 401, Whitby, Ontario L1N 7H8
Whitby: 619 Brock Street South, Whitby, Ontario L1N 4L1
Bowmanville: 29 Scugog Street, Bowmanville, Ontario L1C 3H7
Haliburton: 83 Maple Avenue, Unit 8C, Haliburton, Ontario K0M 2B0
Innisfil: 1000 Innisfil Beach Road, Innisfil, Ontario L9S 2B5
Stouffville: 20 Freel Lane, Unit 9 Second floor, Stouffville, Ontario L4A 8B9

LEGAL GUIDELINES FOR BUSINESSES DURING COVID

Ontario moved into Step Three of Ontario's Roadmap to Reopen plan on July 16, 2021. Businesses can now resume additional indoor services with larger numbers of people, provided certain restrictions are in place. Ontario will remain in Step Three until 80% of the eligible population aged 12 and over has received one dose of a COVID-19 vaccine and 75% have received a second dose, with no public health unit having less than 70% of their eligible population aged 12 and over fully vaccinated.

While Ontario's business sector is opening up, orders under the [*Reopening Ontario \(A Flexible Response to COVID-19\) Act, 2020, S.O. 2020, c. 17*](#) have been extended until August 18, 2021. Here are some of the orders of which businesses should be aware:

Prohibition on Charging Unconscionable Prices for Sales of Necessary Goods

- No person or business shall sell or offer to sell necessary goods at an unconscionable price
- Unconscionable prices include prices that grossly exceeds the price at which similar goods are available to customers, and necessary goods include the following:
 - Masks and gloves to be used as personal protective equipment;
 - Non-prescription medication to treat symptoms of COVID-19;
 - Disinfecting agents intended for cleaning and disinfecting objects or humans; and
 - Personal hygiene products including soap and paper products.



Maximum Increases in Compensation

- During the applicable moderation period, no employer may provide to non-represented employees any incremental increases to existing compensation entitlements or new compensation entitlements that in total equal more than 1% on average for each 12 month period of the moderation period.
- This excludes any temporary COVID-19 related payments received by employees in relation to work performed during the temporary suspension period or workplaces which include long-term care homes, psychiatric facilities, or retirement houses.



Abby Leung
(Summer Law Student)

NEWS & SPONSORSHIPS

UPCOMING WEBINARS

Marty Rabinovitch, head of DSF's employment law department will be hosting an HR/Employment webinar in September. Please visit our website for updates.



Marty Rabinovitch
416-446-5826 | marty.rabinovitch@devrylaw.ca

DSF sponsored the Barrie Business Awards hosted by the Barrie Chamber of Commerce where Redline Brewhouse won a trophy for business excellence in the hospitality industry.



Woitzik Polsinelli LLP ('WP Law') sponsored 'Trek for Shelter' in support of the Royal LePage Shelter Foundation, Canada's largest public foundation dedicated exclusively to funding women's shelters and violence prevention programs. This event funded two local women's shelters: The Denise House and Y's Wish Shelter of YWCA Durham Region.



WP Law sponsored two events for the Durham Region Association Of Realtors: 'Professional Development Day' and their annual 'Charity Golf Tournament', both in support of Achieving Beyond Brain Injury Charitable Foundation.



WP Law is a diamond sponsor for Century 21 Leading Edge Realty's annual Golf Day in Toronto.



DSF participated in the Rotary Club of Barrie 2021 Virtual Fun Run and Walk event. The annual event raises funds for the Barrie community.



BLOGS

ENFORCEABILITY OF MANDATORY COVID-19 VACCINATION POLICIES IN THE WORKPLACE



Marty Rabinovitch

416-446-5826 | marty.rabinovitch@devrylaw.ca

To date, Canada's federal and provincial governments have not introduced any legislation which would require all eligible individuals to be vaccinated against COVID-19. However, would a mandatory vaccination policy introduced by an employer be legally enforceable? If employees refuse to get vaccinated, would an employer be justified to prohibit the employee from attending at the workplace, to place them on an unpaid leave of absence, or to terminate their employment or otherwise discipline the employee? In addressing this issue, there are two competing interests.

HEALTH AND SAFETY CONCERNS OF EMPLOYERS

On the one hand, an employer must take reasonable steps to maintain a safe working environment. This includes taking measures to protect its employees from contracting COVID-19. For example, employers must follow the current public health advice with respect to physical distancing, masking, and daily COVID-19 screening of employees. An employer may argue that since the evidence demonstrates that all approved COVID-19 vaccines in Canada are highly effective at reducing one's chances of contracting the virus, and have a low risk of causing serious side effects, requiring all employees to be vaccinated is a reasonable step to prevent a COVID-19 outbreak in the workplace.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND PRIVACY CONCERNS OF EMPLOYEES

On the other hand, the Ontario [Human Rights Code](#) prohibits employers from discriminating against employees based on several grounds, such as disability and religion, up to the point of undue hardship. For example, if an employee is unable to be vaccinated for medical reasons, the employer would have an obligation to provide a reasonable accommodation to the employee. Examples of such accommodations would include permitting the employee to work from home, or permitting the employee to attend at the employer's premises, provided that they physically distance and/or wear a mask at all times.

Further, some employees may not wish to disclose their vaccination status to the employer, on the basis that this information constitutes personal health information. An employee's vaccination status does likely constitute personal health information under privacy legislation. However, requesting that an employee disclose their vaccination status in the interest of maintaining a safe and COVID-19 free workplace may be permissible, as long as the employer has a policy in place which sets out why the information is being collected, how the confidentiality of the information will be protected, who will have access to it, the purpose for which it will be used, where it will be stored, and the period of time for which it will be kept by the employer.

WHICH WILL PREVAIL?

The courts have not yet addressed the issue of whether mandatory vaccination policies will be enforceable. It will likely depend on the type of workplace and the job duties of the employees in question.

In an office setting, employers will likely be able to accommodate most employees who refuse to get vaccinated on the basis of a protected *Human Rights Code* ground. For example, employees may be permitted to work from home, to work in a relatively isolated area of the office, and/or be required to wear a mask. Where such accommodations would be reasonable, an employer would likely not be justified in terminating or otherwise disciplining an employee who refused to get vaccinated.

However, a mandatory vaccination policy for health care workers at retirement homes or hospitals, who generally cannot work from home, is more likely to be enforceable. Many patients at hospitals and elderly residents would

be considered “high risk” if they contracted COVID-19 and would be vulnerable to contracting the virus from an unvaccinated employee with whom they would be in regular contact. Physical distancing is likely not possible at all times and in many cases, wearing a mask would be insufficient protection for other employees, residents, and patients.

In a situation where an employee makes a personal choice not to get vaccinated for a reason that would not be protected by the *Human Rights Code* (such as general vaccine hesitancy or belief in conspiracy theories), in certain workplaces the employer may be permitted to place the employee on an unpaid leave of absence until the pandemic has ended or even terminate the employee for failing to comply with the employer’s vaccination policy.

As we continue to gain scientific knowledge about COVID-19 and its variants of concern, the effectiveness of the various COVID-19 vaccines, and their possible immediate and long-term side effects, the enforceability of mandatory vaccination policies is likely to change. On the one hand, if certain COVID-19 vaccines prove to be even more effective than previously thought of preventing serious and/or fatal cases of COVID-19, then mandatory vaccination policies will be more likely to be held enforceable. On the other hand, if the vaccines ultimately prove to be less effective than initially thought, and/or they can be linked to more severe side effects, mandatory vaccination policies will be more likely to be held unenforceable.

The courts will eventually be required to determine where to draw the line between the health and safety concerns of employers and the human rights and privacy concerns of employees. Each case will be determined on its specific facts.

“This article is intended to inform. Its content does not constitute legal advice and should not be relied upon by readers as such. If you require legal assistance, please see a lawyer. Each case is unique and a lawyer with good training and sound judgment can provide you with advice tailored to your specific situation and needs.”

WHY THE CAS SHOULDN’T BE DICTATING THE TERMS OF YOUR ACCESS ORDER



Sarah Robus

249-888-4642 | sarah.robust@devrylaw.ca

In child protection matters, the Children’s Aid Society (“the Society”), as a litigant, may start a court application against a parent if they believe that a child is in need of protection. The Society then asks the Court to make an order with respect to what intervention is necessary to protect the child(ren). For example, should the child be placed in the care of the parent or another person, subject to the supervision of the Society, or should the child be placed in interim or extended Society care?

There has been a divide in the case law on whether an access order can be at the discretion of a Society. However, in *J.S.R. v. Children’s Aid Society of Ottawa*, 2021 ONSC 630 the Ontario Divisional Court confirmed that the authority to make an order with respect to access rests solely with the judiciary and cannot be delegated to a third party, including the Society.

In [*J.S.R. v. Children’s Aid Society of Ottawa*, 2021 ONSC 630 \(CanLII\)](#), the mother appealed the decision of the trial judge, who ordered that her two young children be placed in extended Society care, with her access to the children being at the Society’s discretion and in accordance with the best interests of the children. The appellant mother appealed this decision and asked that her children be placed in her custody with Society supervision. In the alternative, she asked for specific access to both children if they were to remain in the care of the Society.

The appellant mother appealed this decision and asked that her children be placed in her custody with Society supervision. In the alternative, she asked for specific access to both children if they were to remain in the care of the Society.

In determining whether the trial judge erred in ordering that access be at the Society's discretion, the court considered Sections 104 and 105 of the [Child, Youth and Family Services Act, 2017, S.O. 2017, c. 14, Sched. 1](#) (the "CYFSA"), which mandate that it is the court that must determine what access is in a child's best interests, not the Society.

In order to determine the best interests of the child, the court analyzes the factors set out in Section 74(3) of the CYFSA which include considering the child's views and wishes, relationship with parents, and physical, mental, and emotional needs. Having found that the access orders were made in favour of the appellant mother, the court turned to the question of whether a court could delegate all aspects of access, including all decision about type, frequency, and duration to the Society. The court reviewed the arguments made in previous cases in support of and against delegating a child's access at the discretion of a Society.

In reviewing these cases, the court determined that discretion cannot simply be delegated solely to the Society or to anyone else. Case law relied on by the Society, such as [H.\(C.\) v. Children's Aid Society of Durham \(County\), 2003 CanLII 57951](#), was distinguished on the basis that it considered an appeal of a temporary order, whereas this case concerned a final decision.

As Sections 104 and 105 of the CYFSA do not either explicitly or implicitly provide the court any powers to delegate its authority to make access orders, the court found that the trial judge erred in law by delegating the discretionary elements of access to being at the sole discretion of the Society. The appeal with respect to the terms of access was allowed and the matter was remitted to the trial judge to determine the appropriate process for finally determining the terms and conditions of access.

Conclusion

In making this finding, the court noted that it would be rare for legislation to authorize a court to delegate its judicial functions to any third party who is also a party to the litigation when neutrality and objectivity are essential to the decision-making process.

The court's decision is important in clarifying both the interpretation of Sections 104 and 105 of the CYFSA and the role of the court in making access orders. By distinguishing access orders made at temporary versus final hearings, different rules may apply for terms of access at the discretion of the Society depending on the type of order. For now, this decision helps to ensure that no party to the litigation, including the Society, will have sole discretion in defining access to children pursuant to a final order.

"This article is intended to inform. Its content does not constitute legal advice and should not be relied upon by readers as such. If you require legal assistance, please see a lawyer. Each case is unique and a lawyer with good training and sound judgment can provide you with advice tailored to your specific situation and needs."

CHANGES IN ONTARIO ESTATE LAW FOR 2021



Vanessa Romanino
289-220-3246 | vanessa@durhamlawyer.ca

There have been many new changes to Ontario estate law and there are more to come. This is the start of a much-needed refresher in this area of law. Among these changes are the new simplified procedure for small estate administration, Bill 245, witnessing wills and Powers of Attorney, and the proposed legislation on spousal entitlement on intestacy (dying without a Will).

In discussing the summary of these changes, there are also potential influences these changes could have on Ontario estate administration and estate planning.

The first topic of discussion is the [New Processes for Administering Small Estates](#):

As of April 1, 2021, new legislation and regulations have been implemented. The new procedures aim to deliver a smooth administration process by accelerating probate timing on smaller estate matters and providing a more cost-effective option.

The term “Small Estate” was introduced in [The Estates Act](#) under [The Smarter and Stronger Justice Act](#). A Small Estate is valued at \$150,000 or less, and the details of these procedures are as follows:

- Completing more accessible application forms for a “Small Estate Certificate,” which is an alternative to the standard process for a “Certificate of Appointment of Estate Trustee with/without a Will.”
- The application form for a Small Estate Certificate is used when a person dies with or without a will.
- The requirement for the applicant to provide supporting documents has been removed for specific cases. The applicant can complete a form stating notice has been provided, without the necessity to include an affidavit of service.
- The application does not require the express consent of interested parties to the applicant’s appointment as an estate trustee. However, the applicant must provide at least a 30-day notice to all interested parties.
- Estate trustees will not be required to post a bond unless there are minor or incapable beneficiaries.

Estate trustees will typically have to wait until probate is granted before going to any bank or financial institution. With the new administration process on Small Estates, there is a greater chance that these estates will not be left unsettled due to the costs related to probate. However, the estate administration tax will still be applicable and payable on estate monies over \$50,000.00.

The second topic of discussion is [Bill 245, the Accelerating Access to Justice Act, 2021](#). Introduced in February of 2021 and receiving royal assent on April 19, 2021, it is a point of reform to an outdated system, as reflected in Schedule 9. Schedule 9 of the Act was amended to provide for the remote witnessing of wills through the means of audio-visual communication technology for wills made on and after April 7, 2020.”

[The Succession Law Reform Act](#) (“SLRA”) now provides remote witnessing of wills upon its amendment. This is done through audio-visual communication technology for wills. As well, the execution of a will must be completed in counterpart executions moving forward (you cannot have a single document circulated and signed by all parties). This shall be mirrored for Powers of Attorney, once proclaimed.

The following sections will also be updated, once proclaimed:

- Section 16 SLRA has been repealed concerning the automatic revocation of any pre-existing wills by marriage so that any susceptible or older Ontario citizens are protected from predatory marriages. The rights of separated spouses have also been updated to safeguard those who did not attain an official divorce.
- Subsection 17(2) SLRA is modified to include separated spouses.
- Section 21.1 is added to the SLRA to provide authority to the Superior Court of Justice to either revoke, alter, revive or validate documents on an application if those documents are believed to be the deceased’s testamentary intentions.
- Section 43.1 has been added to SLRA to exclude separated spouses from inheriting on intestacy.

The third topic of discussion is Spousal Entitlement on Intestacy; this will occur when a deceased person does not have a will or dies with a will that does not fully encompass all of their assets. A spouse under this legislation is referred to as a married spouse only.

A framework is outlined in the *Succession Law Reform Act* to determine how assets are distributed. These are based on the surviving kin. A spouse is entitled to “preferential share,” and any children have an interest in the balance. Preferential share has been increased from \$200,000 to \$350,000 if the deceased has died intestate on or before March 1, 2021. The importance of having a valid will in place to manage any assets you may have is vital.

“This article is intended to inform. Its content does not constitute legal advice and should not be relied upon by readers as such. If you require legal assistance, please see a lawyer. Each case is unique and a lawyer with good training and sound judgment can provide you with advice tailored to your specific situation and needs.”

UNDERSTANDING TITLE INSURANCE IN ONTARIO



Corrine V. Joseph
289-638-3181 | corrine.joseph@devrylaw.ca

The title of a property is used to define the right of ownership to the land. In purchasing a home, the title of the property is transferred to the new owner or owners. The insurance related to this protects residential or commercial property owners and lenders from losses related to the title or ownership of the property. Although the province of Ontario states that title insurance is optional, if you have purchased a home or commercial property in Ontario, it was most likely communicated to you that title insurance needs to be purchased as it is a requirement for any mortgage lender.

There are two types of title insurance policies: The first is the *Owner's* policy which protects the property owner from certain title-related losses typically listed in the insurance policy. The second is the *Lender's* policy covering the Lender from losses that occur if the mortgage is invalid or unenforceable.

What does Title Insurance Cover?

The title insurance policy you purchase will be in place for as long as you hold possession of the property. As with most insurance policies, they are in place to provide the purchaser coverage to protect from potential losses. A

Residential Title insurance policy could provide coverage against losses from:

- Unknown title defects (title issues that prevent you from having clear ownership of the property);
- Existing liens against the property's title (e.g., the previous owner had unpaid debts from utilities, mortgages, property taxes, or condominium charges secured against the property);
- Encroachment issues (e.g., a structure on your property needs to be removed because it is on your neighbor's property);
- Title fraud;
- Errors in surveys and public records.

It is also essential to also consider what Title Insurance does not cover, which could include:

- Known title defects (that were revealed to you before you purchased your property);
- Environmental hazards (e.g., soil contamination);
- Native land claims;
- Problems that would only be discovered by a new survey or inspection of your property (e.g., the property is smaller than initially thought);
- Matters that are not listed in public records (e.g., unrecorded liens and encroachments); and
- Zoning bylaw violations from changes, renovations, or additions to your property or land that you are responsible for creating.

It will also not provide compensation for issues that are not related to home warranty or home insurance. Issues such as:

- Damages due to flooding, fire, or sewer backup;
- General wear and tear of your home (e.g., replacing old windows, a leaky roof, or an old furnace);
- Theft (e.g., a burglar breaks into your home and steals your television); and
- Other losses or damages due to non-title related issues.

Benefits of Title Insurance

The benefits of title insurance will allow property owners comprehensive coverage for a one-time cost usually due during purchase closings or refinances. Not only will this allow for peace of mind for the purchasers, but you can be sure that if any defects affect the title of your home, these will be covered by your title insurance policy,

and your problem could be easily corrected, which lends peace of mind to the purchasers.

If you are looking to order title insurance, [Stewart Title](#) and [First Canadian](#) are well-known Title Insurers. You can speak to a lawyer on how to proceed with obtaining title insurance.

"This article is intended to inform. Its content does not constitute legal advice and should not be relied upon by readers as such. If you require legal assistance, please see a lawyer. Each case is unique and a lawyer with good training and sound judgment can provide you with advice tailored to your specific situation and needs."

SURVEILLANCE, SOCIAL MEDIA AND PERSONAL INJURY DISPUTES



Timothy Gindi
416-446-3340 | timothy.gindi@devrylaw.ca

The rapid technological advancements of our time can create implications when the laws surrounding their use are unclear or have yet to be addressed. Our judicial system is often left playing catch-up to legal questions surrounding technology and interaction with people's rights and other issues of public policy. On the one hand, technology can greatly benefit people's access to information, but on the other hand, it is important that people's privacy is respected when such information becomes much more easily accessible by way of technological development.

Our judicial and parliamentary system is always changing and enacting laws to help adequately address the delicate balance between these two competing interests. For this reason, it is a good idea to ensure you are always aware of how your information can be gathered and used against you in court. For example, the development of Google Earth cameras has raised the issue of invasive surveillance,

and whether and how this surveillance can be used for evidence in a car accident lawsuit.

Is Google Earth the next "Big Brother"?

Of all the means by which our daily lives can be monitored, Google Earth is not at the top of this list. As it currently stands, evidence gathered by Google Earth cameras is not something to be concerned about; footage of the accident taken from these cameras is not often used in car accident cases. One of the reasons for this is because the pictures that are taken by a Google Earth camera are updated every one to three years. This makes the chance of your appearance on Google Earth extremely unlikely. This is good news considering that the average Canadian is caught on camera an average of 70 times every day.

If an image is captured by Google Earth, can it be used in Court? If so, how?

There are still a small number of instances where footage taken by Google Earth cameras is used in court as evidence against opposing parties in personal injury disputes. They are used to supplement the otherwise commonly-used maps and 3D models to illustrate to a judge or jury about the true nature of the accident. Though its use is technically possible, it would mean that an image would have to be captured at the exact moment of your accident – a very unlikely occurrence.

Are there other means by which a video of my car accident may be recorded?

While there will not be footage of your accident taken by Google Earth, it does not mean that an image or footage of your accident does not exist. In fact, if the accident occurred in a major city, it is more likely than not that it was captured by some nearby street or building camera. Getting access to such footage before they are taped over is difficult and an immediate follow-up investigation would have to be done. This is not often seen other than when police authorities conduct this investigation due to a serious injury or fatality and possible criminal charges being laid.

In personal injury disputes, your own social media presence will be immediately investigated for information about you and your lifestyle. For this reason, your lawyer will warn you about the dangers of being on social media and the impact that it can have on your case. Though you might think that a post is innocuous, opposing parties can be very creative in using that post against your claims. It is usually best to stay away from social media altogether during the duration of your case.

In addition, it is recommended that you seek a lawyer's services if you are involved in a personal injury dispute. This is perhaps the best way for you to protect yourself and your interests since the stakes in a serious car accident can be high. In addition, your lawyer can help you get the highest possible amount of compensation to which you are entitled.

"This article is intended to inform. Its content does not constitute legal advice and should not be relied upon by readers as such. If you require legal assistance, please see a lawyer. Each case is unique and a lawyer with good training and sound judgment can provide you with advice tailored to your specific situation and needs."

AN UPDATE ON COVID-19 TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS



Asher Frankel

416-446-4041 | asher.frankel@devrylaw.ca

As vaccination rates increase in Canada, and COVID-19 infection rates decline, the Canadian government is gradually relaxing its strict travel restrictions and quarantine requirements. Prior to this past July 6th, Canada's borders were closed to all discretionary non-essential travel, with limited exceptions, and those who were permitted to enter were subject to a 14-day quarantine requirement, regardless of vaccination status, also with limited exceptions. Those entering Canada by air were also subject to a 3-day stay in a government-authorized hotel.

Effective July 6th, all individuals permitted to enter Canada for an essential non-discretionary purpose, or due to an exemption, who have evidence of being fully vaccinated, together with a negative PCR test obtained within 72 hours prior to coming to Canada and are asymptomatic, are exempt from the quarantine requirement, including the hotel stay. To be considered fully vaccinated, the traveler must have

received the full series of a vaccine or a combination of vaccines that are accepted by the Canadian government, and the last vaccine must have been administered at least 14 days prior to entering Canada. Individuals who cannot be fully vaccinated due to a health condition may also qualify for the eased quarantine and testing requirements currently available to fully vaccinated travelers but must follow a modified quarantine.

Commencing August 9th, United States permanent residents and citizens who are residing in the U.S. are allowed to enter Canada for non-essential discretionary travel. Thus, as of the date of this blog, U.S. citizens and permanent residents who are fully vaccinated may enter Canada for any purpose on a quarantine-exempt basis. Also, effective August 9th, all travelers to Canada by air, who remain subject to the quarantine requirement, will no longer be required to stay in a government-approved hotel, which requirement has been eliminated.

All travelers, whether or not fully vaccinated, must provide COVID-19 related information electronically, prior to traveling, through the ArriveCAN app or web version, meet all pre-entry testing requirements, be asymptomatic upon arrival, and have a paper or digital copy of their vaccination documentation in English or French to present to government officials on request.

Provided that Canada's COVID-19 situation remains favourable, the Canadian government has announced its intention to open Canada's borders for non-essential discretionary travel to all international travelers effective September 7th. At that time travelers to Canada from anywhere who are fully vaccinated and who meet specific entry requirements will be able to enter Canada freely.

As a final note, the current rules governing entry into the U.S. are very different and non-reciprocal from Canada. To summarize: anyone who has been in Canada for 14 days prior to travel by air to the U.S., has been able to do so throughout the pandemic without needing to demonstrate an essential non-discretionary purpose. However,

at the land border, the U.S. still requires an essential non-discretionary purpose for entry with limited exceptions, notwithstanding Canada's new policy to admit U.S. citizens and permanent residents for any purpose, as described above. With respect to quarantine, the U.S. did not have any such requirement on the federal level throughout the pandemic, however, certain states imposed a quarantine requirement at different times.

Should you require additional information about the current state of the law in Canada or the U.S., or upcoming changes, please contact the firm's immigration group.

"This article is intended to inform. Its content does not constitute legal advice and should not be relied upon by readers as such. If you require legal assistance, please see a lawyer. Each case is unique and a lawyer with good training and sound judgment can provide you with advice tailored to your specific situation and needs."

OUR FIRM IS GROWING



Zakiya Bhayat LL.B., LL.M

Zakiya Bhayat joined DSF in 2021 as an associate lawyer in our Family Law Group in Toronto. She earned her LL.B. at the University of Birmingham in the United Kingdom, graduating with First Class Honours, and obtained her LL.M. at Osgoode Hall Law School. She was called to the bar in 2020. Zakiya has appeared at all levels of court in Ontario for various conferences, motions, and trials. Zakiya is also trained in collaborative family law.



Steven Huryn PH.D., J.D.

Steven joined DSF as an associate lawyer in our Real Estate and Corporate Law departments upon being called to the bar in 2021 after completion of his articling position. Prior to studying law, Steven completed his Master's degree and earned a Ph.D. in Environmental Science from the University of Toronto. Steven graduated from the Juris Doctor program at the University of Western Ontario. Steven regularly drafts and negotiates a wide range of corporate and real estate-related agreements and documents, including agreements of purchase and sale, and loan and security documents.



Katherine Klein B.A., LL.B.

Katherine Klein joined DSF as an associate lawyer in our Wills and Estates Group in Barrie upon being called to the bar in 2021 after completion of her articling position. She studied at the University of Toronto, where she obtained an Honours Bachelor of Arts. Katherine also holds an LL.B. from the University of Kent in the United Kingdom. Katherine's professional knowledge, sensible approach, and ability to understand difficult and emotional situations, enable her to assist our clients in all aspects of their estate matters and to provide the best possible legal representation.

LOCATIONS



Devry Smith Frank *LLP* - Toronto
95 Barber Greene Road #100,
Toronto, ON M3C 3E9



Devry Smith Frank *LLP* - Barrie
85 Bayfield Street 3rd floor,
Barrie, ON L4M 3A7



Devry Smith Frank *LLP* - Whitby
209 Dundas Street East #401,
Whitby, ON L1N 7H8

Devry Smith Frank *LLP* - Bowmanville
29 Scugog Street,
Bowmanville, Ontario L1C 3H7

Devry Smith Frank *LLP* - Haliburton
83 Maple Avenue, Unit 8C,
Haliburton, Ontario K0M 2B0

Devry Smith Frank *LLP* - Innisfil
1000 Innisfil Beach Road,
Innisfil, Ontario L9S 2B5

Woitzik Polsinelli *LLP* - Stouffville
20 Freel Lane, Unit 9 Second floor,
Stouffville, Ontario L4A 8B9

Woitzik Polsinelli *LLP* - Whitby
619 Brock Street South,
Whitby, Ontario L1N 4L1

LETTER FROM OUR MANAGING PARTNER



Devry Smith Frank *LLP* ('DSF') has always recognized the contribution of small businesses and corporations which for many years has served as a backbone of our economy. In light of Ontario's reopening plan, businesses are subject to strict government guidelines and DSF is proactively playing a part to help them cope with the stress by providing them with sound legal advice as they stand on their feet.

DSF is pleased to welcome three new lawyers to our office: [Steven Huryn](#), [Zakiya Bhayat](#) and [Katherine Klein](#).

Steven joined DSF as a summer law student and returned as an articling student in 2020. After being called to the Ontario Bar, he joined our [Real Estate](#) and [Corporate Law](#) departments. He is very passionate about both these areas of law. Zakiya is part of our Toronto [Family Law](#) Department and brings to DSF her extensive litigation experience in divorce and separation, custody/decision-making, parenting time/access, support, property, and child protection proceedings. Katherine Klein joined our [Barrie Wills and Estates](#) department as an associate lawyer. She articulated with the firm in 2020 and returned as a lawyer upon being called to the bar. Katherine's professional knowledge, sensible approach, and ability to understand difficult and emotional situations, enable her to assist our clients in all aspects of their estate matters and provide the best possible legal representation.

DSF and our sister firm [Woitzik Polsinelli LLP](#) continue to welcome new opportunities that nourish our entrepreneurial relationships. Our clients can be assured of our accessibility, expert services and guidance at a time where the province is repealing its restrictions and reopening its doors.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'L. Keown', written in a cursive style.

Larry Keown

Managing Partner

larry.keown@devrylaw.ca | (416) 446-5815

Devry Smith Frank *LLP*
Lawyers & Mediators